

## REMARKS

A total of 23 claims remain in the present application. The foregoing amendments are presented in response to the Final Office Action mailed, August 18, 2006 wherefore reconsideration of this application is requested. By way of the above-noted amendments, claims 6, 15, and 24 have been amended to more clearly define features of the present invention, and in particular to emphasize the features that respective CDCs are calculated for each record, and that the method of the present invention is performed entirely within the token, rather than using resources of a handset, for example. In preparing the foregoing claim amendments, careful attention was paid to ensure that no new subject matter has been introduced.

Referring now to the text of the Final Action; claims 2-22 and 24-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the teaching of United States Patent No. 6,968,209 (Ahlgren et al.) in view of United States Patent No. 6,879,989 (Cheng et al.).

The Examiner's claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 103 are believed to be traversed in view of the above-noted claim amendments, and further in view of following discussion.

The present invention provides methods in which a respective CDC is calculated for each one of a plurality of records stored in the memory of a token. This calculation is performed entirely within the token, and thus does not utilize resources of a device in which the token is placed. These features provide a number of benefits. For example, a change in any one individual record can be detected, so that registering the changed records with the registering element can be performed on a per-record basis. This, in turn dramatically reduces the amount of data which must be transferred, which makes it possible to use a Short Message Service (SMS) to accomplish the needed data transfer. Thus the present invention enables a remote system (i.e. the registering element) to be continuously synchronized with the records stored in the memory of the token.

In contrast, the system of Ahlgren calculates a single CDC across all of the records saved in memory. As a result, the CDC of Ahlgren can only detect that a record within the database has changed, and so recognise the need to perform a synchronization operation. However, the CDC of Ahlgren can not determine which ones of the records need to be updated,

and so can only be used to indicate the need for performing a synchronization operation. Unlike the present invention, Ahlgren's CDC provides no means for limiting the amount of data that must be transferred during synchronization. Those of ordinary skill in the art will recognise that this limitation precludes use of SMS signalling for the synchronization operation, for at least the reason that SMS signalling lacks sufficient bandwidth to accomplish the necessary data transfer in a reasonable amount of time.

In that respect, it will be noted that Ahlgren does teach the use of a "User identifier (UID) field ... added for each record to detect record changes and also to identify a latest version of each record." (Col. 3, lines 18-21). However, Ahlgren does not teach or fairly suggest that the UID field is used to enable continuous synchronization, as in the present invention. In fact, Ahlgren does not provide any teaching at all regarding how the UID field is actually used, beyond a general statement of its intended purpose. Thus the person of ordinary skill in the art will be forced to conclude that fully conventional methods are intended to be used.

Clearly, there is a variety of conventionally known information (such as a version number, or change date, for example) that could be inserted into Ahlgren's UID field to accomplish its stated purpose. However, the fact that Ahlgren expressly teaches calculation of a CDC in respect of the database, and further teaches the use of the CDC for detecting the need for synchronization, clearly indicates that the calculation of a respective CDC for each record, and the use of such CDC for controlling a synchronization process, is not conventional. Based on Ahlgren's teachings, if Ahlgren had intended his UID field to be used in this manner, it is reasonable to expect that he would have included at least a reference to this. The fact that he did not, supports the Applicant's position that this functionality was not intended.

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that the presently claimed invention is clearly distinguishable over the teaching of Ahlgren et al. None of the known prior art provides the missing teaching. In particular, none of the known prior art references teach or fairly suggest the calculation of a respective CDC for each record, and the use of that respective CDC to send information of changes to a registering element via SMS messaging. Nor to any of the cited reference teach or fairly suggest the advantages obtained thereby.

Accordingly, it is believed that the present invention is in condition for allowance, and early action in that respect is courteously solicited.

If any extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is required to obtain entry of this response, such extension is hereby respectfully requested. If there are any fees due under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17 which are not enclosed herewith, including any fees required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, please charge such fees to our Deposit Account No. 19-\$113.

Respectfully submitted,

/Kent Daniels/  
By: Kent Daniels, P.Eng.  
Reg. No. 44,206  
Attorney for the Applicants

Date: October 18, 2006

Ogilvy Renault LLP  
Suite 1500  
1981 McGill College Avenue  
Montreal, Quebec  
Canada, H3A 2Y3  
(613) 780-8673